

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002
Questions and Answer Round 1 - Questions 1 to 14
Posted April 6th, 2018**

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
1.	In clause DOE-H-2044 Material Data Sheet Availability, is the term Material Data Sheet (MDS) synonymous with Safety Data Sheet (SDS)?	Yes.
2.	Does the Contractor have to pay for travel to vendors to witness testing?	The Contractor is responsible for paying for all of its own travel. However, the Contractor is not responsible for paying the cost associated with DOE, or any of DOE's other contractors, for any travel.
3.	Is there a weight limit for the dump trucks?	There are no Y-12 or DOE-imposed weight limits. The dump trucks shall comply with Department of Transportation standard public road limitations.
4.	Who is responsible for any soils, debris, etc. that exceeds the ORR landfill radiological limit (e.g. characterization, packaging, transport and disposal)?	Responsibility will be determined in accordance with Section I clause FAR 52.236-2 <i>Differing Site Conditions</i> and Section J Attachment J-8 <i>General Conditions and Special Conditions</i> , GC-6 <i>Hazardous Materials</i> .
5.	Is Radiological Worker Training required for this contract?	Radiological Worker Training is only required for individual(s) performing radiological surveys.
6.	In H.29 <i>Oversight of Contractor</i> , the RFP states that the Site Contractors will evaluate the Contractor's "programs, procedures, systems, processes, and policies regarding health and safety, housekeeping, environmental requirements, radiation protection, security, quality assurance, industrial hygiene, criticality safety, and related operations". What is the level of effort to support this?	The level of effort associated with H.29 <i>Oversight of Contractor</i> is anticipated to be covered as ancillary duties executed by the Key Personnel.
7.	For proposal preparation purposes, what are the requirements and specifics required for "integrating and coordinating site activities with the Y-12 contractor" found in C.2.1 <i>General Work Requirements</i> ?	The level of effort associated with the C.2.1 <i>General Work Requirements</i> reference of "integrating and coordinating site activities with the Y-12 contractor" is anticipated to be covered as ancillary duties executed by the Key Personnel.

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002
Questions and Answer Round 1 - Questions 1 to 14
Posted April 6th, 2018**

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
8.	Why are drawings C941001-F-0010, C941001-F-0011, C941001-F-0018, C941002-F-0002, C941002-F-0003, and C941002-F-0011 missing from the civil drawing package?	The drawings in question have not been included in Attachment J-2 <i>Drawings</i> as they are not applicable to this contract scope. They are to be performed by others as a part of Early Site Preparation. Drawings not found in Attachment J-2 may be found in the <i>Documents Library</i> for reference purposes only.
9.	In GC-3 <i>Materials</i> , it states “all of the equipment, material, supplies and other items to be furnished by the Contractor and incorporated into the project scope shall be new, unused, of first rate quality, suitable for use in the work and in strict conformity with the Contract Documents”. Does the language in GC-3 include construction equipment or vehicles used by the contractor?	No. The term equipment as used in GC-3 encompasses only that equipment delivered to the Government and constitutes part of the facility and/or is used in the operation of the facility.
10.	Subcontracting as defined by FAR 52.219-9 applies to both services as well as supplies, the definition of meaningful work in H. 31 <i>Subcontracted Work</i> appears to limit its scope to subcontracts for labor/services. Please confirm whether “meaningful work” is limited to subcontracts for services. Is there a minimum percentage of “meaningful work” that prime contractors will be required to meet?	Whether the purpose of a subcontract is to provide a service or supply is not dispositive as to whether it would be considered “Meaningful Work” as contemplated in H.31 <i>Subcontracted Work</i> . There is not a contractual requirement for a minimum percentage of subcontracts that must be for “meaningful work”.
11.	21 CLINs and 36 SubCLINs is a high quantity for a firm-fixed-price construction contract. Can DOE work to consolidate these to a more reasonable quantity?	The current CLIN structure will remain as-is. DOE has made a decision that each given CLIN will be fully funded upon execution, and funds for all CLINs will not be provided at time of contract award. Please see L.20 DOE-L-2011 <i>Proposal Preparation Instruction, Volume III – Price Proposal</i> , paragraph (c) for the anticipated Funding Profile.
12.	Will this project be subject to the 413.3B Critical Decision process for CD-2 and CD-3? If so, what would be the contractor’s requirements for input?	DOE Headquarters CD-2/3 approval will occur prior to award of the OF200 MTF contract, therefore there is no input required for CD-2/3 approval from the contractor.

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002
Questions and Answer Round 1 - Questions 1 to 14
Posted April 6th, 2018**

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
13.	Is there an expectation that the contractor will be required to be EVMS certified in accordance with DOE G 413.3–10? Or, since this is a firm-fixed-price contract, will an EVM process as described in DOE O 413.3b Attachment 1, Section 3.c. be the alternative to EVMS certification?	Because the procurement is for a firm-fixed-price contract, offerors will not be required to have an EVMS certification. DOE O 413.3b does require EVMS reporting for this capital asset project, however DOE will utilize data received from the contractor in accordance with H.34 <i>Project Management Systems and Reporting Requirements</i> , along with detailed invoices required by G.5 DOE-G-2005 <i>Billing Instructions</i> and/or G.6 DOE-G-2006 <i>Submission of Request for Progress Payments</i> to meet the DOE O 413.3b EVMS requirements.
14.	Can DOE revise the OCI language found in Section L to provide clarity on whether or not the successful offeror for OF200 MTF will be excluded from competing for the forthcoming ORR Cleanup contract(s)?	<p>DOE has determined that no amendment is necessary in response to the question/issue posed. DOE reiterates that there is the potential for a conflict of interest that cannot be mitigated between performing as the prime contractor between the OF200 MTF and ORR Cleanup contract(s).</p> <p>Any determination as to the existence of a conflict of interest, and whether it can be mitigated, will be determined by the Contracting Officer of the ORR Cleanup contract(s), dependent upon the specific circumstances at that given time, in accordance with the procedures articulated in FAR Subpart 9.5 <i>Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest</i> as supplemented by DEAR Subpart 909.5.</p>